



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,310	09/11/2003	Tooru Takahashi	242629US-2SCONT	3589
22850	7590	11/17/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.				CHURCH, CRAIG E
1940 DUKE STREET				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2882		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

11/1

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,310	TAKAHASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Craig E. Church	2882	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2005.
- 2a)  This action is FINAL. 2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 17-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 17-25 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:
  1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims 18-20 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims recite how the claimed apparatus may be used but fail to further define the structure of parent claim 17 as required.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph as failing to provide an adequate written description. The differences in structural limitations conveyed by "fluoroscopy" as compared to "imaging" have not been specified since fluoroscopy is, in fact, imaging.

Claims 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2882

Claims 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a,e) as being anticipated by Jensen et al (6175614). Jensen teaches an x-ray apparatus with an automatic brightness system (ABS) comprising x-ray tube 100 operated at a predetermined loading factor (current and high voltage); collimator 102 (beam limiting unit); detector 108/110 (image generating unit) for generating an image of a predetermined size based on x rays passing through an object region of interest; collimator control (region set unit) that sets the imaging region; region of interest defining means 114 (region transform unit that determines whether the region defined by the collimator superposes the predefined region and transforms the region of interest if necessary based in part on collimation parameters 128 (lines 30-39 of column 3, lines 42-49 of column 4 and lines 28-33 of column 8); data processor (brightness computing unit 116 that calculates brightness of a predetermined region in the image and ABS control 118 (a controller that determines the x-ray tube loading factor based on brightness and performs feedback control of the loading factor, lines 11-14 of column 10).

Applicant's arguments filed July 27, and September 7, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are based on how the claimed apparatus is to be operated rather than on a comparison between the claimed structure and that taught by Jensen. Furthermore, the distinction between "fluoroscopy" limitations and "imaging" limitations has not been explained since fluoroscopy is, in fact, imaging and does not appear in the disclosure as alleged.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Church at telephone number (571) 272-2488.

*Craig E. Church*

Craig E. Church  
Senior Examiner  
Art Unit 2882